


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:)	I hereby certify that this paper (along
)	with any paper referred to as being
Annette R. Steudel et al.)	attached or enclosed) is being
)	transmitted via the Office electronic
Serial No. 10/506,985)	filing system in accordance with §
)	1.6(a)(4).
Filed: March 3, 2003 (Int'l Appl. No.)	
PCT/GB2003/00899))	
)	August 5, 2009
For: Polymerisable Compositions And)	
Organic Light-Emitting Devices)	
Containing Them)	
)	
Group Art Unit: 1796)	Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
)	Attorney for Applicants
Examiner: Ling-Siu Choi)	
)	
Confirmation No. 8932)	

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The applicants hereby request that a panel of examiners formally review the legal and factual bases of the rejections in the above-referenced application prior to the filing of an appeal brief. The applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are inadequate for the reasons concisely described herein.

Claims 1-38 are pending, but claims 16-25 and 27-38 have been withdrawn. Claims 6, 9-15, and 26 have been objected, but are allowable in substance.

Submitted herewith is a Notice of Appeal.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 10 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as assertedly indefinite. In response, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 10

further defines claim 9 from which it depends. Similarly, claim 13 further defines claim 12. Accordingly, the rejections should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over Tanamura et al. (JP 10-144469) in view of Thompson et al. (US Patent 6,210,814). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Tanamura discloses reacting a polyfunctional acrylate monomer with a polyfunctional mercapto compound to form a photo-setting resin that is used to manufacture a transparent, heat resistant *substrate* of an organic electroluminescent device.

Thompson discloses an *emissive layer* comprising (1) a host material, (2) an emissive molecule as a first dopant in the host material, and (3) a polarization molecule that affects the wavelength of light emitted by the emissive molecule when the emissive molecule luminesces as a second dopant in the host material.

Substrates and emissive layers are well known to be distinct layers having distinct functions in light emitting devices. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the *substrate* of Tanamura to include either the emissive molecule dopant or the polarization molecule dopant disclosed in the *emissive layer* of Thompson.

Furthermore, neither the monomer containing polyfunctional acrylate nor the polyfunctional mercapto compound disclosed in Tanamura are charge transporting or light emissive, as recited in claims 1-5, 7, and 8. Rather, they are actually transparent and insulative in order to form a heat resistant, transparent substrate as described therein. In any case, there is certainly no disclosure or suggestion in Tanamura of further providing an emissive dopant or a charge transporting dopant in the insulative, transparent substrate disclosed therein. Further, Thompson fails to provide any motivation to incorporate such a dopant into the substrate disclosed by Tanamura.

Finally, including a charge transporting dopant or emissive dopant, as claimed, into the substrate disclosed by Tanamura is at odds with the teachings of Tanamura and would likely render the substrate disclosed in Tanamura inoperative for its intended purpose. For example, the substrate of Tanamura would have decreased heat

resistance and transparency after incorporating a charge transporting dopant or emissive dopant therein.

Accordingly, there is insufficient motivation to combine Tanamura and Thompson and the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-15 and 26 should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

August 5, 2009



Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,160
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300